

REMARKS

Claims 1-28, 31-33, and 36-38 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated August 8, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to claims 1, 8, 11, 17, 18, 25, 26, 31, 36, and 37.
- B.) Rejected claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19, 25-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle Forms® Advanced Techniques, ch. 10, pp. 1-18* (“Oracle”) in view of *Austin* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0037119) (“Austin”).
- C.) Rejected claims 6, 16, 20, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092) (“Francis”).
- D.) Rejected claims 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Laverty, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,593) (“Laverty”) and further in view of *Austin*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

- A.) Objection to claims 1, 8, 11, 17, 18, 25, 26, 31, 36, and 37:

Claims 1, 8, 11, 17, 18, 25, 26, 31, 36, and 37 have each been amended as per the Examiner’s request to correct the typographical error to overcome the objection.

Applicants respectfully submit the objection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

- B.) Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19, 25-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle Forms® Advanced Techniques, ch. 10, pp. 1-18* (“Oracle”) in view of *Austin* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0037119) (“Austin”):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17-21, 25, 26, 31, and 36-38 have each been amended to clarify that, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory, an import filter is used to analyze the data stream to identify the embedded object/data contained in the document.

Applicants’ independent claims 1, 7-11, 17-19, 25, 26, and 31, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to initiating loading a document as a data stream into memory. While the document is being loaded as a data stream into memory, an input filter analyses the

data stream to identify whether an embedded object/data is contained in the document. And also while the document is being loaded into memory, when it is determined that the first program is an unavailable program, the embedded object/data is automatically converted from a first format, which corresponds to a first program, to a second format that is different from the first format and suitable for use with a second program.

Thus, Applicants' claimed invention inventively converts an embedded object/data within a document "on-the-fly" while the document is being loaded as a data stream into memory. This provides a seamless and conversion that may not require user interaction.

This is clearly unlike *Oracle* in view of *Austin*, which fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Oracle* fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting embedded data while a document is loaded into memory. (*Office Action of 8/8/2006*, page 5). Instead, *Oracle* merely allows a user to manually initiate conversion of an OLE object to a new format, after the related document has been loaded into memory, by selecting the convert option on the Object submenu of the OLE popup menu. (*Oracle*, page 17).

Austin also fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory. Similar to *Oracle*, *Austin* discloses a method for converting data after it has been loaded into memory. *Austin* [0122]. As clearly in *Austin*, a data access nodes receives data from a data source. *Austin* [0122]. The "data access node may then convert the received data." *Austin* [0122] (emphasis added). Therefore, unlike Applicants' claimed invention, *Austin* does not convert data while it is being loaded as a data stream into memory. Further, nowhere does *Austin* suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory.

Thus, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 7-11, 17-19, 25, 26, and 31.

Claims 2-5, 12-15, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, and 35 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, 26, or 31 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11, 26, and 31 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 6, 16, 20, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092) ("Francis")*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Regarding claims 6 and 16:

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable over *Oracle* in view of *Austin* as discussed above. *Francis* still fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory. Nowhere does *Francis* suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory. Thus, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 11.

Claims 6 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

Regarding claims 20-24:

Applicants' independent claim 20, as amended, also claims using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory.

As discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 11, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis* fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory.. Thus, for at least this reason, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* and further in view of *Francis* fails to disclose or suggest claim 20.

Claims 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 20 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejection of claims 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Laverty, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,593)* ("*Laverty*") and further in view of *Austin*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 36-38, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory.

As discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 11, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* fails to disclose or suggest this claimed subject matter. Thus, for at least this reason, *Oracle* in view of *Austin* fails to disclose or suggest claims 36-38.

Laverty also fails to disclose or suggest using an import filter to analyze a data stream to identify an embedded object/data contained in a document, while the document is loaded as a data stream into a memory. Thus, *Oracle* in view of *Laverty* and further in view of *Austin* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 36-38.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/
Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No. 45,034
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000
Customer No. 58328